

## REMARKS

The three-month period for responding to the initial Office Action expired on September 11, 2009. A Request for a Three-Month Extension of Time and the related fee are enclosed herewith. Accordingly, this Response is timely filed.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. By this Amendment, the term "locking means" is being substituted for "locking geometry" throughout the specification and claims. In addition, a reference sign on page 15 of the specification is being corrected. Claims 1, 3, 8, 12, 16, 19-21 and 25 are being amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention. The addition of "new matter" has been scrupulously avoided. Claims 1-27 remain in this application.

In the initial Office Action, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as allegedly failing to show the dispenser and housing recited in previously presented claim 20. Amended claim 20 no longer recites these elements and instead is directed to a holder for mounting the lock mechanism, such as the holder 38 shown in original Fig. 3 and described on page 14, lines 18-20 of the original specification.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

Claims 1-27, as previously presented, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. Each of the instances of indefiniteness noted by the Examiner has been addressed and remedied by this Amendment.

More particularly, in claim 1 (and claims 3, 8, and 21) the phrase "locking geometry" has been replaced by "locking means". The specification has also been amended to provide antecedent support for this replacement terminology. The locking means is exemplified by the locking nose 32 illustrated in the original drawings and mentioned on page 13, lines 9-13 and elsewhere in the original specification.

The preamble of claim 12 has been amended to delete the previous reference to the lock mechanism of claim 1 and, therefore, avoid any question of inconsistency of terminology. The third subparagraph of claim 12 has been amended for enhanced clarity.

Claim 20, as rewritten, is now directed to the lock mechanism of claim 1 in combination with a holder for mounting this lock mechanism. The amended claim is believed to be clear and definite.

For enhanced clarity, claims 16, 21 and 25 have been further amended to ensure clear antecedent basis.

In view of these amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The indication that claims 1-27 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is gratefully acknowledged.

All of the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

If it would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the below indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeff Rothenberg, Reg. No. 26,429  
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: December 11, 2009

Heslin Rothenberg Farley & Mesiti P.C.  
5 Columbia Circle  
Albany, NY 12203  
Tel: 518-452-5600  
Fax: 518-452-5579